

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

Teresa Greene,

Plaintiff,

v.

Equifax Information Services, LLC,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Civil Action File No.:

**COMPLAINT
WITH JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. The United States Congress has found the banking system is dependent upon fair and accurate credit reporting. Inaccurate credit reports directly impair the efficiency of the banking system, and unfair credit reporting methods undermine the public confidence, which is essential to the continued functioning of the banking system. Congress enacted the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S. Code § 1681, *et seq.* (the “FCRA”) to ensure fair and accurate reporting, promote efficiency in the banking system, and protect consumer privacy.

2. Under the FCRA, consumer reporting agencies are charged with two primary duties: the duty to follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum

possible accuracy of information when preparing consumer reports; and the duty to reasonably reinvestigate consumers' disputes of inaccurate information, and then appropriately correct or modify the disputed information. A consumer reporting agency's duty to reasonably reinvestigate consumers' disputes of inaccurate information explicitly includes the duty to notify the furnisher of the disputed information. This is because the furnisher of the disputed information stands in a better position to make a thorough investigation of the disputed information than the credit reporting agency.

3. Defendant compiles, maintains, and reports information concerning Plaintiff's credit-worthiness, credit-standing, credit capacity, character, and general reputation. That information is then made available for use by third-parties in credit transactions involving Plaintiff, for employment purposes, the underwriting of insurance for Plaintiff, and even in connection with a determination of Plaintiff's eligibility for a license or other governmental benefit. Accordingly, and pursuant to various provisions of the FCRA, Plaintiff has a legally protected interest in Defendant fulfilling its respective duties under the FCRA, so that the information reported and maintained by Defendant is done so in a manner which is fair and

equitable to Plaintiff, with regards to the confidentiality, accuracy, and relevancy of that information.

4. This action for damages is based on Defendant's false reporting on Plaintiff's credit file and/or consumer reports, failures to follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of the information concerning Plaintiff, and failures to conduct reasonable investigations and reinvestigations with respect to disputes of such information.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff, Teresa Greene, is a natural person who resides in Clayton County, Georgia.

6. Plaintiff is an individual and is, therefore, a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(c).

7. Defendant, Equifax Information Services, LLC, (hereinafter "Equifax"), is a limited liability company formed under the laws of the State of Georgia and registered to do business in the State of Georgia. Equifax may be served with process via its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, at 2 Sun Court, Suite 400, Peachtree Corners, GA 30092.

8. Equifax regularly assembles and/or evaluates consumer credit information for the purpose of furnishing consumer reports to third parties and uses interstate commerce to prepare and/or furnish the reports. Accordingly, Equifax is a “consumer reporting agency” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1681a(f).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”), 15 U.S.C. § 1681, *et seq.*, claims pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681p and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 9-10-91(1) because, *inter alia*, Defendant frequently and routinely conducts business in the State of Georgia, including the conduct complained of herein.

11. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, venue is proper in the Northern District of Georgia because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district.

12. Pursuant to LR 3.1B(3), venue is proper in the Atlanta Division because Defendant maintains an agent for service of process within the Atlanta Division.

ALLEGATIONS OF FACT

Plaintiff's Mortgage

13. On or about March 7, 2008, Plaintiff obtained a residential home loan from Freedom Mortgage Corporation for the original principal amount of \$130,965 (the "Mortgage").

14. The Mortgage was transferred to Midfirst Bank ("Midfirst").

15. Plaintiff has continued to make her Mortgage payments to Midfirst, and Midfirst has continued to service Plaintiff's Mortgage and accept her Mortgage payments.

16. 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) requires consumer reporting agencies to follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of information concerning the individual about whom a report relates. Similarly, 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1) requires consumer reporting agencies to conduct reasonable reinvestigations of a consumer's dispute of the completeness or accuracy of any item of information contained in the consumer's file.

17. As an integral aspect of its duties under the FCRA, Equifax is required to have in place adequate and reasonable policies and procedures to assure the maximum possible accuracy of information concerning individuals about whom

Equifax produces reports; the requirement to maintain reasonable procedures extends to Equifax's handling and reinvestigation of disputed information.

The National CRAs and the Furnishers of Consumer Information Communicate Metro 2 Compliant Notices of Consumer Disputes and Responses, Respectively, Through the e-Oscar Reporting Platform

18. The FCRA requires CRAs to implement an automated reinvestigation system through which furnishers of information to the CRA may report the results of a reinvestigation that finds incomplete or inaccurate information in a consumer's file. 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(5)(D).

19. To comply with the automated dispute reinvestigation requirements of the FCRA, Trans Union, Equifax, and Experian (the three major "National CRAs"), along with Innovis Data Solutions, Inc., developed and implemented a browser-based software system that allows the CRAs to electronically notify furnishers quickly and easily of disputed credit reporting information, and for furnishers to quickly and easily respond to such disputes following the furnisher's investigation of the disputed information.

20. The system is commonly referred to as e-OSCAR (Online Solution for Complete and Accurate Reporting) and was designed to be Metro 2 compliant. See <http://www.e-oscar.org/> (last accessed December 12, 2022).

21. The e-OSCAR system primarily supports Automated Credit Dispute Verification (“ACDV”) and Automated Universal Data Form (“AUD”) processing, as well as other consumer-dispute-related processes. *Id.*

22. The National CRAs, provide notice of a consumer’s dispute to data furnishers in the ACDV format, and forward the ACDV to the furnisher through e-OSCAR.

23. If a furnisher’s investigation of a consumer’s dispute determines that the information in dispute is incomplete or inaccurate, the FCRA requires the furnisher to correct the information not only with the CRA that sent the ACDV, but with all other CRAs to whom the furnisher reported that information. 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-2(b)(1)(D).

24. The e-OSCAR system facilitates the furnisher’s compliance with 15 U.S.C. § 1681s-2(b)(1)(D) by sending a “Carbon Copy” of an ACDV response “to each CRA with whom the [furnisher] has a reporting relationship” in addition to the response to the initiating CRA. See <https://www.e-oscar.org/implementation/about-us> (last accessed December 12, 2022).

25. Additionally, a furnisher can manually correct a tradeline with a CRA other than the one that initiated a dispute by sending an AUD within e-OSCAR.

26. The failure on the part of a CRA and/or a furnisher to adhere to the accepted Metro 2 standards can itself support a finding of willful violation as described by 15 U.S.C. § 1681n when that failure results in a report that is false, incomplete, and misleading.

27. Further, the failure to adhere to the Metro 2 format, and/or the failure to follow the guidance of regulatory and industry sources, such as the CDIA, is evidence of willfulness of an FCRA violation under 15 U.S.C. § 1681n(a). *See, Gillespie v. Equifax Info. Servs., LLC*, No. 05C138, 2008 WL 4316950, at *8 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 15, 2008).

The Metro 2 Guidelines Mandate Regular Monthly Reporting of All Accounts

28. As part of that industry standard, the Metro 2 Format Task Force has declared, “All accounts must be reported *on a monthly basis*.” [Emphasis added] CRRG at 2-2.

29. Because consumer credit information changes monthly, failure to update that information on a monthly basis, yet still publishing reports containing the previously reported information without updates, means that the information being reported is almost certainly incomplete, inaccurate, and misleading.

Plaintiff’s Equifax Consumer Report

30. On or about November 23, 2021, Plaintiff obtained a copy of her consumer report as published by Equifax.

31. That report contained erroneous information as provided by Midfirst, and as published and reported by Equifax.

32. The relevant portion of the Midfirst tradeline appeared in the November 23, 2021 report as showing that the account balance was \$0, the monthly payment was \$0, and the account status as closed.

33. Plaintiff continues to make payments to Midfirst on the Mortgage, the information described above was both false and misleading in a number of key respects (the “Inaccurate Reporting”), including, *inter alia*:

- a. The Mortgage’s balance is reported as \$0, rather than the actual current balance of the account;
- b. The date of last payment fails to reflect payments made by Plaintiff; and
- c. The tradeline was not reported in compliance with CDIA / Metro 2 standards.

34. The Inaccurate Reporting was in derogation of accepted industry standards for reporting the Mortgage as set forth by the CDIA and Metro 2 and as adopted by Defendant, including, *inter alia*:

- a. The Balance is reported as \$0, rather than the current balance;
and
- b. The Scheduled Monthly Payment is reported as \$0, rather than
the monthly payment as required by Metro 2.

35. In a letter dated February 8, 2022 Plaintiff disputed the inaccurate and misleading information directly to Equifax and advised Equifax that her mortgage was not closed, did not have an account balance of \$0 or a monthly payment of \$0.

36. The dispute letter provided Defendant with sufficient information to identify and correct the inaccurate reporting.

37. The fact that Plaintiff's mortgage was not closed was objectively and readily verifiable information.

38. The fact that Plaintiff's mortgage balance was not \$0 was objectively and readily verifiable information.

39. The fact that Plaintiff's monthly mortgage payment was not \$0 was objectively and readily verifiable information.

40. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681i, Equifax had a duty to notify Midfirst of Plaintiff's dispute within five business days of receiving the dispute, to forward the supporting documents submitted with Plaintiff's dispute for Midfirst's review, to conduct a reasonable reinvestigation of the disputed information, and to correct the tradeline or delete it from Plaintiff's consumer file.

41. Upon information and belief, Equifax timely notified Midfirst of Plaintiff's dispute, via e-OSCAR or otherwise, and provided the supporting documents submitted with Plaintiff's dispute.

42. Alternatively, Equifax failed to notify Midfirst of Plaintiff's dispute, and/or failed to provide the supporting documents submitted with Plaintiff's dispute.

43. Equifax provided a reinvestigation dated May 25, 2022 which included the tradeline as reported "post-investigation" which reproduced the errors identified by Plaintiff in her original dispute letter.

44. Plaintiff accessed her Experian credit report again in November of 2022 and it contained the same errors which Plaintiff had previously disputed.

45. Plaintiff again disputed the information directly to Equifax in June of 2023.

46. Plaintiff incurred lost time and out of pocket expenses including postage to send her dispute in June of 2023.

47. Equifax did not respond to Plaintiff's June 2023 dispute.

48. Upon information and belief, Equifax failed to notify Midfirst of Plaintiff's dispute and to provide the supporting documents supplied by Plaintiff as required by 15 U.S.C. § 1681i despite its written assurance to Plaintiff to the contrary.

49. Upon information and belief, Defendant did not perform any reinvestigation of Plaintiff's dispute, under either "standard" or "expedited" procedures, as described by § 1681i(a)(8), but instead simply repeated the inaccurate tradeline information.

50. Plaintiff's dispute was neither frivolous nor irrelevant.

51. Defendant did not inform Plaintiff that it had determined the dispute was frivolous or irrelevant.

52. Defendant never informed Plaintiff that it required additional information to investigate Plaintiff's dispute.

53. Plaintiff accessed her Equifax credit report again in July of 2023.

54. The July 2023 Equifax credit report contained the same errors which Plaintiff had disputed multiple times over the past two years.

55. Defendant's post-investigation reporting is, independently and jointly, false and misleading.

56. Defendant's post-investigation reporting is in derogation of the Metro 2 reporting standards, and that departure and failure to adhere to the adopted guidelines renders the reporting both false and materially misleading, as users of consumer reports assume Defendant's compliance with Metro 2 standards in reporting consumer information.

57. There is no indication in the tradeline of the "verified" report that Plaintiff has disputed the information reported and published by Defendant, and the failure to note Plaintiff's legitimate dispute of the Midfirst tradeline renders the reporting materially misleading.

58. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the revised tradeline reflects any information provided by Midfirst to Equifax in response to Plaintiff's dispute.

INJURIES-IN-FACT

59. Defendant's actions and omissions have caused Plaintiff to lose time attempting to correct the false information on Plaintiff's consumer reports.

60. The time spent by a person attempting to correct a false credit report constitutes a concrete injury for purposes of an FCRA claim. *Pinson v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, Nat'l Ass'n*, No. 16-17107, 2019 U.S. App. LEXIS 33662, at *5 (11th Cir. Nov. 12, 2019), citing *Pedro v. Equifax, Inc.*, 868 F.3d 1275, 1280 (11th Cir. 2017).

61. Defendant's actions and omissions have resulted in the illegitimate suppression of Plaintiff's FICO credit score and other credit rating model scores.

62. The adverse effect on Plaintiff's credit scores places Plaintiff at the material risk of being denied credit or receiving less favorable credit terms than she otherwise would.

63. Further, the Courts have regularly held that allegations of lower credit scores, taken as true, are sufficient to allege a concrete injury-in-fact for the purposes of standing under Article III. *Pedro v. Equifax, Inc.*, 868 F.3d 1275 (11th Cir. 2017) (“[H]er credit score dropped 100 points as a result of the challenged conduct. Because Pedro alleged that she suffered an injury in fact, she has standing to pursue her complaint.”); *Diedrich v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC*, 839 F.3d 583 (7th Cir. 2016) (standing where Plaintiffs alleged that they “have suffered damage to their credit and been forced to pay Ocwen greater payments and a higher interest rate”);

Santangelo v. Comcast Corp., 162 F. Supp. 3d 691 (N.D. Ill. 2016) (“a depleted credit score is sufficient to constitute an injury-in-fact for the purposes of establishing Article III standing”); *Binns v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC*, No. 14-01764, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 132743, 2015 WL 5785693, at *9 (S.D. Ind. Sept. 30, 2015) (“injuries to plaintiffs’ credit scores and reputations were considered intangible harms”); *Rothman v. U.S. Bank Nat’l Ass’n*, No. 13-03381, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 141100, 2014 WL 4966907, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2014) (“Injury to a credit score is sufficient to constitute ‘actual damages’”); *Green v. RentGrow, Inc.*, No. 2:16cv421, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 166229 (“A decrease in credit score may still establish an injury in fact sufficient to confer standing”); *Adams v. Fifth Third Bank*, No. 3:16-CV-00218-TBR, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18932 (W.D. Ky. Feb. 9, 2017) (“Plaintiffs’ allegations of lower credit scores ... are sufficient to allege a concrete injury-in-fact for the purposes of standing under Article III.”); and, *Coulbertson v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.*, No. 16-cv-05672-RS, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69484 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2017) (“At a minimum, Coulbertson has alleged a sufficient injury-in-fact through her claim that her credit score suffered as a result of the credit report she disputes”).

64. Defendant's actions and omissions have resulted in the illegitimate suppression of Plaintiff's credit-based insurance scores.

65. The adverse effect on Plaintiff's credit-based insurance scores places Plaintiff at the material risk of being denied insurance or receiving less favorable insurance rates and terms than she otherwise would.

66. Defendant's actions and omissions have caused Plaintiff's credit reports to falsely indicate that Plaintiff's Mortgage is closed and has a balance of \$0.

67. Plaintiff's correct payment history would be included in Plaintiff's Equifax credit report if Defendant had conducted appropriate investigation of Plaintiff's dispute.

68. However, because the Mortgage is falsely reported in Plaintiff's Equifax credit report as having a \$0 balance and a \$0 monthly mortgage payment, Plaintiff will be forced to pursue alternative, more time-consuming, and more expensive means of demonstrating her payment history to a potential lender.

69. Because Defendant failed to comply with their duties under the FCRA as detailed herein, Plaintiff will need to obtain and provide verification of the Mortgage, bank statements, and/or other documents to demonstrate his payment history for the previous 12 months.

70. This requires Plaintiff to expend more time, effort, and money due to Defendant's failures to abide by their obligations under the FCRA.

DAMAGES

Actual Damages

71. As a result of Defendant's actions and omissions, Plaintiff has suffered actual damages.

72. These damages include out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a result of Defendant's wrongful representations regarding the Mortgage, and Defendant's failures to abide by their obligations under the FCRA.

73. Plaintiff has suffered a decrease in Plaintiff's credit score as a result of Defendant's wrongful representations regarding the Mortgage, and Defendant's failures to abide by their obligations under the FCRA.

74. Plaintiff has also experienced physical symptoms of aggravation, frustration, and stress due to the fact that Defendant is thwarting Plaintiff from receiving the Fresh Start guaranteed by bankruptcy process and discharge.

Statutory and Punitive Damages

75. At the time Defendant reported the information at issue in this matter, Defendant had actual notice that the information it was reporting regarding Plaintiff and the Mortgage was false, deceptive, and misleading.

76. For example, Plaintiff included corroborating documents with her dispute, which was more than sufficient to establish that the disputed information was being reported inaccurately.

77. Defendant would have further reason to doubt the accuracy of reporting Plaintiff's Mortgage in such a way as to indicate the Mortgage was discharged in bankruptcy (as described *supra*), because the *Bankruptcy Case itself* has not yet been discharged (a fact which is itself apparent from the face of Plaintiff's credit reports). Even if the Mortgage account was eligible for discharge (which it is not), it clearly could not have been discharged while the bankruptcy is still ongoing.

78. Finally, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Midfirst has previously provided Equifax with information containing these same (or substantially similar) errors on a multitude of occasions, thus placing Equifax on notice of Midfirst's unreliability, and deficiencies in Midfirst's systems and procedures, which have repeatedly caused these errors to propagate in data provided by Midfirst and elude correction upon dispute by consumers.

79. Defendant had more than enough information to correct its false, deceptive, and misleading reporting.

80. Despite that, Defendant continued to report the false, deceptive, and misleading information regarding Plaintiff and the Mortgage.

81. Defendant failed to correct its false, deceptive, and misleading reporting, and in fact continued to report false, deceptive, and misleading information regarding Plaintiff, as described herein.

82. Accordingly, Defendant's conduct was willful.

83. As a result of Defendant's willful actions and omissions, Plaintiff is eligible to recover actual damages or statutory damages of up to \$1,000, potential punitive damages, costs of this action, and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681n and/or 1681o.

CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT

15 U.S.C. §§ 1681e(b) and 1681i **Equifax Information Services, LLC**

84. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as though fully stated herein.

85. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b), Equifax is responsible for following reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of information whenever it prepares consumer reports about Plaintiff.

86. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(1)(A), Equifax had an affirmative duty to independently investigate the dispute submitted by Plaintiff.

87. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(2), Equifax was required to communicate the specifics of Plaintiff's disputes to Midfirst, including the forwarding of any documents provided by Plaintiff in support of that dispute.

88. A consumer reporting agency's reasonable reinvestigation must be a good faith effort to ascertain the truth; a reasonable reinvestigation must answer the substance of the consumer's dispute, and may not merely be a *pro forma* record review that simply begs the question.

89. A reasonable reinvestigation clearly requires some degree of careful inquiry, and more than just a superficial inquiry.

90. The reasonableness of a reinvestigation under the FCRA is generally a question of fact for the jury.

91. In order to conduct a reasonable reinvestigation, and pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681i(a)(4), Equifax was required to review and consider all relevant information submitted by Plaintiff.

92. Plaintiff's dispute was clear and unambiguous as to the inaccuracies of Equifax's reporting of the Mortgage.

93. Plaintiff provided all the relevant information necessary for Equifax to conduct a reasonable reinvestigation, and correct the inaccuracies in its reporting.

94. Equifax breached its duties as described herein.

95. If Equifax had conducted a reasonable reinvestigation of Plaintiff's dispute, Equifax would have reviewed and considered all of the information Plaintiff submitted in her dispute, and would have easily detected that what was being reported regarding the Mortgage was factually incorrect, inaccurate, and misleading.

96. If Equifax had conducted a reasonable reinvestigation of Plaintiff's dispute, the Midfirst tradeline on Plaintiff's Equifax consumer report would have been appropriately corrected.

97. Due to Equifax's failures to follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of information, and failures to conduct a reasonable reinvestigation of Plaintiff's dispute, the false and misleading information in

Plaintiff's credit file and on Plaintiff's Equifax report was not appropriately modified.

98. Equifax had all the information necessary to correct its reporting. Despite that, Equifax failed to correct the false, disputed information, in the face of clear evidence that its reporting was false and misleading. That failure indicates that Equifax's reinvestigation procedures were not reasonable.

99. The fact that Equifax had all the information necessary to correct its reporting, yet failed to do so in an appropriate manner, further indicates that Equifax recklessly disregarded Plaintiff's dispute and the requirements of the FCRA, amounting to a willful violation of the statute.

100. Upon information and belief, Equifax has prepared consumer reports containing the incomplete and inaccurate information at issue, and has published the incomplete and inaccurate information to third parties.

101. Equifax willfully, or in the alternative negligently, violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b) by failing to follow reasonable procedures to assure the maximum possible accuracy of information concerning Plaintiff in her consumer reports, in reckless disregard of the statutory requirements, Plaintiff's dispute, and the publicly recorded Bankruptcy Case filings.

102. Equifax willfully, or in the alternative negligently, violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681i in multiple ways, including without limitation, by failing to properly notify Midfirst of Plaintiff's dispute, by failing to provide Midfirst with all the supporting information/documents included with Plaintiff's dispute, by failing to conduct a reasonable reinvestigation of Plaintiff's dispute, and by failing thereafter to appropriately modify information in Plaintiff's file and on her consumer reports, in reckless disregard of the statutory requirements, Plaintiff's dispute, and the publicly recorded Bankruptcy Case filings.

103. As a result of Experian's violations of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681e(b) and 1681i, Plaintiff has suffered actual damages as described herein. Plaintiff is, therefore, entitled to recover actual damages from Equifax pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681n and 1681o.

104. Equifax's actions and omissions were willful, rendering Equifax liable to Plaintiff for punitive damages and/or statutory damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n.

105. Plaintiff is entitled to recover costs and attorneys' fees from Equifax pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681n and 1681o.

TRIAL BY JURY

106. Plaintiff is entitled to and hereby requests a trial by jury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered in her favor and against Defendant for:

- a) Plaintiff's actual damages;
- b) Statutory damages of \$1,000 per violation of the FCRA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n;
- c) Punitive damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681n;
- d) Reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681n and/or 1681o; and
- e) Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Respectfully submitted this 28th day of August, 2023.

BERRY & ASSOCIATES

/s/ Matthew T. Berry

Matthew T. Berry

Georgia Bar No.: 055663

matt@mattberry.com

Telephone: (404) 235-3334

2751 Buford Highway, Suite 600

Atlanta, GA 30324

/s/ Chris Armor

Christopher N. Armor

Georgia Bar No. 614061

P.O. Box 509
Londonderry, Vermont 05148
Phone 651-208-6441
Fax 404-592-6102
chris.armor@armorlaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff